

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending herein. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 are amended to further clarify the subject matter recited by these claims. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to both claims 1 and 2 may be found at, for example, page 13, lines 16-29 of the specification, and at Fig. 5.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP Patent Number 3004793 (hereinafter "JP793"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that JP 793 discloses all the features of claims 1 and 2. In particular, at page 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action cites drawing 1 of JP 793 and asserts that the opening diameter of the insertion hole (see diameter of "insertion hole" 7 closest to "electrode" 2b in drawing 1) on the side of the reflecting surface is greater than the external diameter of the sub-reflection mirror (see diameter of "sub-reflection mirror" 4) while the opening diameter is within the internal diameter of a valid reflection area of the reflector, the internal diameter being defined by a front focal position of the reflector and the outer periphery of the sub-reflection mirror.

However, contrary to the assertion made by the Office Action, there is no explicit disclosure in JP 793 showing that the opening diameter of the insertion hole is within the internal diameter of the valid reflection area of the reflector. Instead, as shown in Fig. 1 of JP 793, the diameter of the film 4 is too small to place the opening diameter of the insertion hole within the internal diameter of the valid reflection area.

That is, JP 793 fails to disclose that the internal diameter of the valid reflection area of the reflector is a diameter of a circle defined by a nodal line between the reflection surface of the reflector and a cone which is formed by the boundary of a light beam shielded by the sub-

reflection mirror out of a light beam reflected by the reflecting surface of the reflector and condensed to the front focal position of the reflector, as recited by each of claims 1 and 2.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that JP 793 fails to disclose the features of claims 1 and 2. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/jth

Date: September 20, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--